IN THE DRAWINGS:

FIGS. 4-15 have been amended as show in red on the attached sheets to correct cross-hatching. Approval of the amendments is requested.

REMARKS

Applicant is submitting herewith proposed drawing changes. The cross hatching of various sealing components has been corrected as discussed during the interview.

Claims 1-48 are currently pending in the application. All pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,869,679 (Szegda).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-48 is requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiners Patel and Imas for the courtesies extended him at the interview on May 25, 2006. At the interview, Szegda and the independent claims currently pending were discussed. It was pointed out that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based upon Szegda was improper, given the many differences in the structures claimed by the Applicant. Many of the amendments made herein to the independent claims are consistent with what was discussed during the interview.

Claim 1 is amended to characterize the sealing assembly as having a first axially facing shoulder and the tubular fitting as having a third axially facing shoulder. The first and third axially facing shoulders abut to each other to prevent the sealing assembly and tubular fitting from being separated from each other by relative axial movement.

The Examiner argues in paragraph 2 of the Action that the allegedly corresponding tubular fitting in Szegda consists of the combination of elements 18, 20 and 22, as seen in Fig. 4 of Szegda. There is no axially facing shoulder on any of these elements that cooperates with an axially facing shoulder on the allegedly corresponding sealing assembly

24 to prevent the sealing assembly and tubular fitting from being separated from each other by relative axially movement.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not taught by Szegda.

Further, since Szegda pre-assembles the element 24 to the port after which the tubular fitting is threaded in place, these parts are required to be separate from each other and thus there is no motivation to cause these components to interact so as to prevent separation, each from the other, by relative axial movement.

Claims 2-6 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the art.

For example, claim 2 characterizes the sealing assembly as having a second shoulder and the tubular fitting as having a fourth shoulder. The first shoulder confronts the third shoulder to confine relative movement between the sealing assembly and the tubular fitting in an axial direction towards each other, with the second shoulder confronting the fourth shoulder to confine relative movement between the sealing assembly and tubular fitting in an axial direction away from each other. Since Szegda lacks any corresponding axially facing, cooperating shoulders, the additional cooperating shoulders further distinguishes over Szegda.

Claim 3 recites the tubular fitting to have a radially outwardly opening annular groove, with the sealing assembly having a radially inwardly projecting bead that extends into the groove. Szegda lacks altogether any teaching or suggestion of any outwardly opening annular groove upon a corresponding tubular fitting.

Claim 7, among other limitations, characterizes the threads on the threaded element of the tubular fitting as having a first effective diameter. The second sealing surface is

characterized as having an inside effective diameter that is greater than the first effective diameter with the sealing portion in the first state. This arrangement facilitates direction of the second sealing surface axially over the threads on the port without interference, whereupon the state of the sealing portion can be changed from the first state therefor into a deformed state wherein the second sealing surface is caused to thereby be moved sealingly radially inwardly against the radially outwardly facing surface on the port.

Szegda's allegedly corresponding sealing assembly is pre-assembled onto the port and thus has an inside diameter that is less than the first effective diameter of the threads on the element 22.

Accordingly, claim 7 is believed allowable.

Claims 8-20 depend cognately from claim 7 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over Szegda.

For example, claim 9 characterizes the threads on the port as having a second effective diameter, with the inside effective diameter of the second sealing surface being greater than the second effective diameter. This allows axial sliding of the second sealing surface over the threads on the port preparatory to changing the sealing portion from the first state into the deformed state therefor. Szegda does not teach or suggest such a relationship of corresponding parts.

Claim 13 characterizes the sealing portion as an o-ring. Szegda does not teach or suggest use of an o-ring in place of the element 24.

Claim 21 recites, among other limitations, that least one of the first and second surfaces is angled relative to the central axis so that as the threaded element is moved in the first axial direction, the first and second surfaces cooperate to cause the first sealing

surface to be wedged radially inwardly sealingly to against the radially outwardly facing surface on the port, as the sealing portion is caused to be changed from its first state into its deformed state. As amended, claim 21 is clarified to indicate that the first sealing surface is caused to be wedged through the at least one of the first and second surfaces that is angled.

In Szegda, the angled surface 24d in Fig. 3 does not cause the first sealing surface to be wedged radially inwardly. It is only coincidental that the surface 24d is angled as shown, but this angled relationship does not produce the recited wedging action. More specifically, Szegda states in column 3, in lines 13-18, that the sealing lip 24e is axially flattened by the flat front of the element 22 as it is rotated to be tightened in place.

Accordingly, claim 21 is not anticipated by Szegda. Szegda does not suggest such a wedging capability and thus claim 21 is believed allowable.

Claims 22-26 depend cognately from claim 21 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over Szegda.

For example, claim 22 characterizes the sealing portion as an o-ring, which is not taught or suggested by Szegda.

Claim 26 recites the sealing assembly and tubular fitting as maintained together as a unitary assembly with the second connecting assembly separated from the first connecting assembly. As noted above, Szegda pre-assembles the element 24 and thus it would be contrary to the teachings in Szegda to unite the allegedly corresponding sealing assembly and tubular fitting.

Claim 27 has been amended to characterize the sealing portion as caused to be deformed to thereby cause the second sealing surface to be moved into contact with and sealingly against the radially outwardly facing surface on the port.

As noted during the interview, Szegda's element 24 is pre-attached to the port by being threaded thereon. Movement of the threaded element does not cause the sealing surface to be moved into contact with a port, as claimed.

Accordingly, claim 27 is believed allowable.

Claims 28-33 each depends from claim 27 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the art.

For example, claim 30 characterizes the sealing portion as an o-ring, with claim 33 characterizing the sealing assembly and tubular fitting as maintained together as a unitary assembly with the second connecting assembly separated from the first connecting assembly.

As noted above, Szegda does not teach or suggest any of these structures.

Claim 34, like 27, includes the limitation that the sealing portion is deformed radially inwardly to be brought into contact with the radially outwardly facing surface and so as to sealingly engage the same.

Claim 35 likewise includes the limitation that the sealing portion is deformed radially inwardly into contact with the outwardly facing surface of the port.

As noted above with respect to claim 27, Szegda does not teach or suggest, among other things, this limitation in claims 34 and 35.

Claims 36-40 each depends from claim 35 and recites further significant limitations to further distinguish over Szegda.

Claim 41 characterizes the cylindrical body and sealing assembly as having a cooperating groove and bead to maintain the sealing assembly and tubular fitting together as a unitary assembly preparatory to connecting the cable connecting assembly to a port.

As noted above, it would be inconsistent with Szegda's teachings to pre-assemble the element 24 to a corresponding cylindrical body since Szegda pre-assembles the element 24 to the port and thereafter assembles the remaining components of the combination.

Claims 42 and 43 each depends from claim 41 and recites further significant structural limitations to further distinguish over Szegda.

For example, claim 43 recites two cooperating pairs of shoulders that abut to limit opposite relative axial movement between the cylindrical body and sealing assembly. Szegda does not teach or suggest any corresponding, cooperating shoulders, let alone the two pairs as claimed.

Claim 44 recites a groove and bead, one each on the sealing assembly and external surface of the cylindrical body, to maintain the same together as a unitary assembly. As noted above, it is inconsistent with Szegda's teachings to include this structure for pre-assembly of these components.

Claims 45-48 depend cognately from claim 44 and recite further significant structural limitations to further distinguish over Szegda.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-48 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: July 3, 2006